

DAVID H. KRAMER, SBN 168452  
 MENG JIA YANG, SBN 311859  
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
 Professional Corporation  
 650 Page Mill Road  
 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050  
 Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100  
 Email: dkramer@wsgr.com  
 Email: mjyang@wsgr.com

AMIT Q. GRESSEL, SBN 307663  
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
 Professional Corporation  
 One Market Plaza  
 Spear Tower, Suite 3300  
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1126  
 Telephone: (415) 947-2000  
 Facsimile: (415) 947-2099  
 Email: agressel@wsgr.com

BRIAN M. WILLEN (*admitted pro hac*)  
 BENJAMIN D. MARGO (*admitted pro hac*)  
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
 Professional Corporation  
 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor  
 New York, NY 10019-6022  
 Telephone: (212) 999-5800  
 Facsimile: (212) 999-5801  
 Email: bwillen@wsgr.com  
 Email: bmargo@wsgr.com

STEFFEN N. JOHNSON (*admitted pro hac*)  
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
 Professional Corporation  
 1700 K Street NW, Fifth Floor  
 Washington, DC 20006-3817  
 Telephone: (202) 973-8800  
 Facsimile: (202) 973-8899  
 Email: sjohnson@wsgr.com

Attorneys for Defendants  
 YOUTUBE, LLC and SUNDAR PICHAI

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 OAKLAND DIVISION

DONALD J. TRUMP, KELLY VICTORY,  
 AUSTEN FLETCHER, AMERICAN  
 CONSERVATIVE UNION, ANDREW  
 BAGGIANI, MARYSE VERONICA JEAN-  
 LOUIS, NAOMI WOLF, and FRANK  
 VALENTINE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

YOUTUBE, LLC and SUNDAR PICHAI,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 4:21-cv-08009-JSW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING  
 PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
 MOTION TO CONSIDER  
 WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE  
 RELATED**

Hon. Jeffrey S. White

1 Plaintiffs have filed an administrative motion under Civil Local Rule 3-12(b) (Dkt. 118),  
2 seeking to relate this action to *Trump v. Twitter, Inc.*, 3:21-cv-08378-JD, currently assigned to  
3 Judge Donato. Defendants in this action oppose the motion (Dkt. 120), as do the defendants in the  
4 *Twitter* action (Dkt. 121).

5 For cases to be related in this District, they must, *inter alia*, “concern substantially the same  
6 parties, property, transaction, or event.” Civ. L.R. 3-12(a). Based on the pleadings in both actions  
7 and the briefs submitted by the parties, the Court finds that this requirement is not satisfied. The  
8 two actions—which involve entirely different defendants and mostly different plaintiffs—do not  
9 “concern substantially the same parties.” They also involve different property, *i.e.*, separate online  
10 services, user content, and social media accounts. Nor do the two actions concern substantially the  
11 same transactions or events—the plaintiffs in each action complain of separate content moderation  
12 decisions, made by YouTube and Twitter respectively, under their own user agreements and  
13 editorial policies.

14  
15 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED** that Plaintiffs’ motion is  
16 DENIED.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18  
19 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

20  
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 The Honorable Jeffrey S. White  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28